

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12 and 13 are amended by the present amendment. No new matter is added.

Support for amendments to the claims can be found, at least, on page 11, in paragraph 0021.

In the outstanding Action, Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Izawa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,264,556, herein "Izawa"); Claims 2, 3, 7 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izawa in view of Blad et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0063035, herein "Blad"); Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izawa and Blad in view of Bryant et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,513,639, herein "Bryant"); Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izawa and Blad in view of Lamah (U.S. Pat. No. 5,788,046); Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izawa and Blad in view of Cassidy et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,615,625, herein "Cassidy"); Claims 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izawa and Blad in view of Handelman et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0048067, herein "Handelman"); and Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izawa and Blad in view of Battrick (U.S. Pat. No. 3,806,651).

Addressing now the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Izawa, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 recites, in part,

        a money validation unit for validating money provided  
        from outside;

        a detachable money storage unit for storing the money  
        that has been determined as valid by said money validation  
        unit;

a first power-signal connection configured to transmit, as a pulse signal, both electric power and a money information signal representing information on the money to be stored in said money storage unit; and

a second power-signal connection configured as a ground,

wherein said money validation unit supplies both said electric power and said money information signal to the detachable money storage unit via the first power-signal connection when said money validation unit is electrically connected to said money storage unit

Izawa describes a gaming machine which includes a bill validator 12 and a note hopper 110. However, Izawa does not describe or suggest two connection terminals, the first connection transmitting, as a pulse signal, both electric power and a money information signal and the second connection configured as a ground.

The outstanding Action relies on Blad as curing the deficiencies of Izawa with regard to the claimed invention.

Blad describes a currency container tracking system, the currency container 100 including a memory module 102. In addition, Blad describes that the memory module connects to a data unit 112 via two contacts 110/104.

However, Blad does not describe or suggest a first power-signal connection configured to transmit, as a pulse signal, both electric power and a money information signal representing information on the money to be stored in said money storage unit.

In other words, although Blad describes two contacts in which data is transmitted from a data unit 112 to a memory module 102, Blad does not describe or suggest that one of the connections transmits *both* electrical power and a money information signal *as a pulse signal*.

In addition, none of the further cited Bryant, Lamah, Cassidy, Handelman or Batrick references cure the above noted deficiencies of Izawa and Blad.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 and claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Izawa, Blad, Bryant, Lamah, Cassidy, Handelman and Battrick considered individually or in any proper combination.

In addition, with respect to the rejection of Claims 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Izawa, Blad and Handelman, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Initially, Applicants note that the outstanding Action states on page 7, second paragraph, that Claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 appear to be written to invoke 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph. In addition, the outstanding Action states that §112, sixth paragraph has not been invoked in the examination process as the Applicant has not formally requested that §112, sixth paragraph, be invoked. Further, the outstanding Action requires that the corresponding structure in the specification for each means plus function recitation must be identified. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 have been amended to remove the term “means” from the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to these claims be withdrawn.

Further, with respect to Claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that although Handelman describes that a RZ (return to zero) code exists, Handelman does not describe that a money information signal generated by said validation side communication control unit is a signal encoded to RZ (return to zero) code format. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art to use the RZ code described in Handelman in the system of Izawa and Blad as there would be no motivation to do so. The outstanding Action states on page 6, that the motivation to combine these references would be so that RZ signal samples could be converted into NRZ signal samples. However, this motivation does not explain why one skilled in the art would decide to take the system of Izawa and Blad, specifically the data signal to the currency container, and convert

this signal using a RZ code. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that, at least for the above noted reasons, Claims 8-13 patentably distinguish over Izawa, Blad and Handelman.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.  
Registration No. 40,440